

COMPLAINT

INTRODUCTION

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1 -

1 § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the
2 laws of the United States.

3 3. Defendant conducts business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
4 and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
5

6 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (b)(1) and (b)(2).
7

8 **PARTIES**

9 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Greensburg, Pennsylvania
10 15601.
11

12 6. Plaintiff is a “consumer” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C.
13 §1692a(3).
14

15 7. Defendant is a corporation with its principal place of business located at
16 350 Camino de la Reina, Suite 100, San Diego, CA 92108.
17

18 8. Defendant is a “debt collector” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C.
19 §1692a(6).
20

21 9. Debt collection is the principal purpose of Defendant’s business.
22

23 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members,
24 directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees,
25 representatives, and insurers.

26 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

27 11. Defendant placed repeated harassing telephone calls to Plaintiff’s father
28

1 regarding an alleged debt that Plaintiff incurred primarily for personal, family or
2 household purposes.

3 12. During these continued calls, Defendant would share Plaintiff's
4 personal information with Plaintiff's father, indicating that Plaintiff owed a debt.
5

6 13. Plaintiff never provided Defendant with her father's contact
7 information, nor did Plaintiff ever give permission for Defendant to call her father.
8

9 14. Plaintiff wrote a letter to Defendant on June 21, 2019 demanding
10 Defendant not speak with any family members concerning her debt. Plaintiff
11 mailed the letter on July 1, 2019. See Exhibit "A".
12

13 15. Once Defendant knew that Plaintiff did not want Defendant contacting
14 her father any continued calls to her father could only have been placed to upset
15 and harass Plaintiff.
16

17 16. However, Defendant continued to call Plaintiff's father.
18

19 17. Defendant's actions as described herein were taken with the intent to
20 harass, upset, and coerce Plaintiff to pay the alleged debt.
21

22 **COUNT I**
23 **DEFENDANT VIOLATED §§1692b(3) OF THE FDCPA**

24 18. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though the same
25 were set forth at length herein.
26
27
28

1 19. Section 1692b(3) of the FDCPA prohibits a debt collector from
2 communicating with any person other than a consumer more than once unless
3 requested to do so by such person or unless the debt collector reasonably believes
4 that the earlier response of such person is erroneous or incomplete and that such
5 person now has correct or complete location information.
6

7
8 20. Defendant violated this section of the FDCPA by communicating with
9 Plaintiff's father more than once regarding Plaintiff's debt, despite having been
10 notified that it was calling the wrong person.
11

12 21. Defendant therefore violated both Section 1692b(3) of the FDCPA.
13

14
15 **COUNT II**
16 **DEFENDANT VIOLATED §1692c(b) OF THE FDCPA**

17 22. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though the same were
18 set forth at length herein
19

20 23. Section 1692c(b) of the FDCPA forbids a debt collector from, in
21 connection with the collection of a debt, with any person other than the consumer,
22 her attorney, a consumer reporting agency if otherwise permitted by law, the
23 creditor, the attorney of the creditor, or the attorney of the debt collector, without
24 the prior consumer of the consumer given directly to the debt collector.
25
26
27
28

1 24. Defendant violated this section of the FDCPA when it communicated,
2 in connection with a debt, with a third party, Plaintiff's father, without having
3 Plaintiff's express permission to do so.
4

5 25. Defendant therefore violated Section 1692c(b) of the FDCPA.
6

7
8 **COUNT III**
9 **DEFENDANT VIOLATED §1692d and d(5) OF THE FDCPA**

10 26. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though the same
11 were set forth at length herein.
12

13 27. Section 1692d of the FDCPA prohibits debt collectors from engaging in
14 any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress or abuse any
15 person, in connection with the collection of a debt.
16

17 28. Section 1692d(5) of the FDCPA prohibits debt collectors from causing
18 a telephone to ring or engaging any person in telephone conversation repeatedly or
19 continuously with intent to annoy, abuse, or harass any person at the called
20 number.
21

22 29. Defendant violated these sections of the FDCPA when it called
23 Plaintiff's father repeatedly knowing that Plaintiff did not want them to contact any
24 third parties concerning her debt.
25
26
27
28

1 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, ARRICKA MAXWELL, respectfully prays for a
2 judgment as follows:

- 3 a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
4
5 b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA
6 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
7
8 c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other
9 litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §
10 1693k(a)(3); and
11
12 d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.
13

14
15 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

16 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, ARRICKA MAXWELL, demands
17 a jury trial in her case.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
26
27
28

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C..

DATED: October 18, 2019

By: /s/ Amy L. Bennecoff Ginsburg

Amy L. Bennecoff Ginsburg

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C

30 East Butler Pike

Ambler, PA 19002

Telephone: (215) 540-8888

Facsimile (215) 540-8817

Email: aginsburg@creditlaw.com